UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN NORTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,	CASE NO: 14-20306
<i>v</i> .	DISTRICT JUDGE THOMAS L. LUDINGTON MAGISTRATE JUDGE PATRICIA T. MORRIS
ERIC MARQUELL BURRELL,	
Defendant.	/

MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S REPORT, FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION CONCERNING PLEA OF GUILTY

I. REPORT AND FINDINGS

This case was referred to the undersigned Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 636(b)(1)(B) and 636(b)(3) for purposes of receiving, on consent of the parties, Defendant's offer of a plea of guilty. Defendant and his counsel appeared before me on September 9, 2014, and pled guilty to Count One of the Indictment. In open court, I examined Defendant under oath, confirmed Defendant's consent, and then advised and questioned Defendant regarding each of the inquiries prescribed by Rule 11(b) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

Based upon Defendant's answers and demeanor, **I HEREBY FIND:** (1) that Defendant is competent to tender a plea; (2) that Defendant's plea was knowingly, intelligently made; and (3) that the offense to which Defendant pleaded guilty is supported by an independent basis in fact containing each of the essential elements of the offense. Therefore, I have ordered the preparation of a presentence investigation report.

1:14-cr-20306-TLL-PTM Doc # 19 Filed 09/09/14 Pg 2 of 3 Pg ID 64

II. **RECOMMENDATION**

For the reasons set forth above, IT IS RECOMMENDED that, subject to the Court's

consideration of the plea agreement pursuant to Rule 11(c) of the Federal Rules of Criminal

Procedure, Defendant's plea to Count 1 of the Indictment be accepted, Defendant be adjudged

guilty and the Court impose sentence.

III. **REVIEW**

Pursuant to Rule 72(b)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, "[w]ithin 14 days after

being served with a copy of the recommended disposition, a party may serve and file specific

written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations. A party may respond to another

party's objections within 14 days after being served with a copy." FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(2). See

also 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Failure to file specific objections constitutes a waiver of any further

right of appeal. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 106 S. Ct. 466, 88 L. Ed.2d 435 (1985); Howard

v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs., 932 F.2d 505 (6th Cir. 1991); United States v. Walters, 638

F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981). The parties are advised that making some objections, but failing to raise

others, will not preserve all the objections a party may have to this Report and Recommendation.

Willis v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs., 931 F.2d 390, 401 (6th Cir. 1991); Smith v. Detroit

Fed'n of Teachers Local 231, 829 F.2d 1370, 1373 (6th Cir. 1987). Pursuant to E.D. Mich. LR

72.1(d)(2), a copy of any objections is to be served upon this Magistrate Judge.

Date: September 9, 2014

/S PATRICIA T. MORRIS

Patricia T. Morris

United States Magistrate Judge

2

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that this Report and Recommendation was electronically filed this date, electronically served on counsel of record, and served on U.S. District Judge Thomas Ludington in the traditional manner.

Date: September 9, 2014 By s/Jean L. Broucek

Case Manager to Magistrate Judge Morris